

Part E: Executive Summary

MD-715 PART E	<i>U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission</i> FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
USAG Fort Riley	For period covering October 1, 2022, to September 30, 2023

Part E.1: Agency Mission and Leadership

Introduction:

This report provides a comprehensive look into data on the command’s Civilian population compared to the Civilian Labor Force (CLF)¹; an overview of challenges that could derail progress towards attaining a model EEO program; detailed action plans to address identified deficiencies; and accomplishments/best practices in EEO, diversity, equity, inclusion, accessibility, and human resources.

Organization and Mission

The Fort Riley, Kansas Garrison’s mission is, through a full spectrum of services and support, to provide a superior quality of life to Soldiers, Families, Civilians, and Retirees; enable Readiness for Warfighters; and collaborate effectively with community partners. The Fort Riley Garrison also provides and integrates world-class installation and partner services/support, enabling readiness by facilitating training, deployment, force protection, quality of life and resiliency for 1ID Soldiers, Families, Total Army Partners, and Retirees. Fort Riley sustains its reputation as the Army’s Best Place to Live, Train, Deploy From, Come Home to, and Retire. Web link: (<https://home.army.mil/riley/index.php>)

Most of the employees on Fort Riley are employed in positions that support the warfighting effort as it pertains to the training and deployment of the Soldiers at Fort Riley as well as a robust medical facility and other programs that support the welfare of the Soldiers and their families. Fort Riley is also the home of a Regional Network Enterprise Center and the Civilian Human Resources Agency Southwest Regional campus that includes the Army Benefits Center-Civilian, Civilian Personnel Processing Center, and the consolidated Office of Workman’s Compensation (OWCP) cell.

The Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) office serves as the focal point for the administration and monitoring of EEO and affirmative employment initiatives and programs. These program services include the following: Providing compliance and program services; advisory services; managing the EEO Complaints Program; providing training and education; preparing and publishing the MD 715 Report, Disabled Veteran’s Affirmative Action Plan, Hispanic Employment Plan and 462 Report; and managing the Affirmative Employment Program, to include Reasonable Accommodations and Special Emphasis programs. EEO is a support function identified as base operations and is part of the Installation’s Garrison staff unit. EEO is responsible for providing technical guidance, direction, and advice while maintaining a continuing Affirmative Employment Program that promotes equal opportunity to identify and eliminate discriminatory practices and policies on the installation.

EEO services ten (10) Major Commands: Army Contracting Command (XD); Army Installation Management Command (BA); Army Criminal Investigation Command (CB); Army Forces Command (FC); Army Cyber Command (G6); Army Medical Command (MC); Civilian Human Resources Agency (CH); HQ DA Staff Field Operating Agencies (SE); Army Sustainment Command (XC); and Army Aviation and Missile Command (X6). This EEO Office also services all Appropriated Fund (APF) and Non-Appropriated Funded (NAF) employees on Fort Riley.

¹ The CLF is defined as those occupations in the national labor market (non-institutionalized individuals 16 years of age or older, employed or unemployed, U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens) that are directly comparable or relevant to occupations at the Department of the Army.

The Principal EEO Official is Ms. Kathy Bellinder, GS-0260-13. The EEO Official position is located under the Installation Support Offices.

FY2023 Organization Chart



Figure 1 Organization Chart

Part E.2: The Six Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

Part G Elements	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	Change from FY22
A. Demonstrated commitment from agency leadership	0	0	0	0
B. Integration of EEO into the agency's strategic mission	5	4	3	-1
C. Management and program accountability	3	3	6	+3
D. Proactive prevention of unlawful discrimination	1	1	0	-1
E. Efficiency	1	2	0	-2
F. Responsiveness and legal compliance	0	0	0	0

Table 4 Army Components' MD-715 Self-Assessment

A. Demonstrated Commitment of Agency Leadership**Strengths**

1. USAG Fort Riley EEO Office developed, implemented, and manages the USAG Exit Interviews. Based on the information supplied in one interview, a 15-6 investigation was initiated. This is one of the tools that is used to ensure the EEO principles are being met.

Deficiencies**B. Integration of EEO into the Agency's Strategic Mission****Strengths**

1. The agency recruits, hires, develops, and retains supervisors and managers who have effective managerial, communications, and interpersonal skills: Fort Riley Garrison recruits, hires, develops, and retains supervisors and managers who have effective managerial, communication, and interpersonal skills. The EEO is instrumental in the success of this part of a model EEO program. The EEO team assists with the hiring process as well as having developed a lot of different trainings that help with the soft skills. Fort Riley has several training and developmental opportunities for its civilian employees to include future leaders. This year, Fort Riley held an in-person Intermediate CES course that was fully attended by Fort Riley civilian personnel. Several managers/supervisors have attended Advanced CES at Fort Leavenworth. Fort Riley created a new leadership program called Basic Executive Leader Training (BELT - Positioning Future Leaders for Tomorrow's Challenges) that covers how to write white papers, brief senior leaders, running working groups, storyboards, budget, and awards, hiring actions, a tour of the installation, and a capstone project. Conflict Management created by the EEO office is another part of this program, but it is its own 4-hour workshop. The first two (2) iterations have been highly successful. As stated above, EEO team members review the hiring matrix, interview questions, and sit in on interviews to make sure the hiring process was done correctly and fairly to hire and retain the best and brightest supervisors/managers.

Deficiencies

1. Sufficient Budget & Staffing: The EEO Office is not authorized to have a special emphasis program manager (SEPM) or an anti-harassment program coordinator. We are required to have four (4) persons in the office but are only authorized three (3). We are also short on funding to send EEO team members to train to develop and maintain their skill sets. Generally, a course that requires travel can cost between \$2,000 - \$3,000, which is a lot out of a \$9,000 annual budget if the training is not centrally funded. Most trainings are not centrally funded and are hard, if not impossible, to get into, especially training at DEOMI. Army is only allowed a certain number of slots, and they are usually filled by the CP28 Fellows, so new specialists are unable to attend.

2. Involvement of Management: The EEO office does not have a dedicated SEPM to have the special emphasis program in place. Therefore, senior management does not participate in the barrier analysis process. A barrier analysis is only completed annually for the MD 715 report. With all the other additional work the EEO team is required to do, it is almost impossible to do anything with the SEPM program throughout the year.

C. Management and Program Accountability

Strengths

1. Anti-Harassment program: The Fort Riley EEO team does a great job managing the Army's Anti-Harassment program. The Fort Riley EEO team saves Fort Riley 4.6 million dollars due to how well the EEO team manages this program. 46 out of our 64 total contacts did not file a precomplaint due to how we manage the anti-harassment program. All allegations of harassment are investigated within the 10-calendar day start timeline. When there are findings of harassment, appropriate action is taken to prevent it from occurring again.

2. The EEO team has developed many different trainings on various EEO topics to include harassment which includes disability. We also offer the following courses: Civility in the Workplace; Disability at Work; and Leveraging Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility in the Workplace.

3. Despite not having a Special Emphasis Program manager position available, the EEO team was able to do some outreach to the local universities on vacancies here at Fort Riley, Schedule A, and other hiring authorities, and how to apply for federal positions this fiscal year.

Deficiencies

Not having Civilian Personnel Advisory Center (CPAC) personnel on site since COVID-19 has had a negative impact on the operations of the EEO office and the installation.

1. Firewall between Anti-Harassment Coordinator (AHPC) and EEO Director: There is no funding/allocation on the TDA for a position for the AHPC. The EEO Director has had a discussion with the Resource Management Director. He is not willing to take a position from a different directorate to move it to the EEO office. It is also not possible to obtain authorization for an over hire position either. Army Headquarters arranged for Civilian Human Resources Agency (CHRA) to be the point of contact for this program. However, they have moved away from the CPAC model, so there is no one on site to take these complaints. There hasn't been on site CPAC personnel since COVID-19. EEO provides information on the anti-harassment program to employees and leaves it up to management/labor attorney to decide how to investigate the allegations. EEO is unaware of the outcome.

2. Firewall between RA Program Manager and EEO Director: EEO office does not have the funding/TDA authorization to have another person on board for the firewall between the RA program manager and the EEO Director. Plus, that position has turned over twice this past fiscal year.

3. Do the HR Director and EEO Director meet regularly to assess whether personnel programs, policies and procedures conform to EEOC laws: The new CPAC Director worked from Fort Sill, Oklahoma. The EEO Officer had a meeting scheduled with the CPAC Director on a trip to Kansas to discuss the personnel programs, policies, and procedures and she cancelled the meeting with the officer. She did not wish to reschedule the meeting. CHRA has gone to a different concept and is no longer operating CPACs.

4. Does the EEO office have timely access to accurate and complete data required to prepare the MD 715 workforce data tables: Until this year, we have not had access to Applicant Pool data. This year we had to have someone else pull the data and send it to us. We still do not have access to that data even though it is captured when applicants submit applications for positions.

5. Develop and/or conduct outreach and recruiting initiatives: Civilian Personnel has not assisted with any outreach or recruiting since prior to COVID -19. Only the Non-Appropriated Fund Human Resource Office has regular hiring or career fair events.

6. Develop and/or provide training for managers and employees: Civilian Personnel has not assisted with any training since prior to COVID-19. Civilian personnel are all working remotely or teleworking. The CPAC Director works out of Fort Sill, Oklahoma and does not attend any meetings here locally. CPAC did away with NEO and HR for Supervisors. Fort Riley created our own NEO called Garrison Riley Onboarding Welcome (GROW). This is where the EEO office provides USAG employees copies of the Garrison Commanders EEO policies and provides an overview of the EEO programs to include anti-harassment.

D. Proactive Prevention of Unlawful Discrimination

Strengths

1. The EEO team was able to accomplish most of the items on our part H and J from fiscal year 22 with only two (2) people in the office for most of the current fiscal year. The EEO team was able to create and deploy the first Exit Interview for all USAG employees that leave the Garrison. One (1) exit interview led to a 15-6 investigation. The EEO team provides input on the results of the interviews to the appropriate USAG Director, so they can address and correct any barriers or issues.

2. The EEO team interviewed minorities in the USAG directorates to try to find out why are Hispanic and other minority numbers are low. We found out that not everyone likes the area here. For some, there is not enough to do and others, it depends on their lifestyle.

3. Interviewed employees that work at the Air Traffic control Tower. The EEO team discovered the data on the trigger table was incorrect showing that no employees with a disability worked there when in fact four (4) employees that work there have a reported disability.

4. The EEO team worked with the Resource Management office (RMO) on the median performance award amount for females. The data appeared to show the females median amount was lower than males. In working with the RMO, we discovered females were paid more for their performance than males.

Deficiencies

1. All the GS-15 positions at Fort Riley are all White males. The EEO team has yet to find a way to break through the "I have someone in mind" or Good 'Ole Boy mind set when hiring behind individuals at that grade level. There was a vacancy this year and another white male was hired.

2. There are a low number of females and minorities in GS-14 positions. Females hold 5 out of 24 GS-14 positions and only three (3) of those are held by minorities, Black to be specific.

E. Efficiency

Strengths

1. Complaint Process: Timelines within the EEO office's purview are consistently being met or exceeded. Average precomplaint processing time was 16 calendar days in FY 23. The Fort Riley EEO team has also assisted two other installations with the processing of their complaints. An EEO team member developed a detailed check list that covers each step of the complaint process and what needs to be done. This has been a great tool for teaching new employees about the complaint process and how to put the complaint files together properly.

2. ADR: The number of mediations is slightly lower in FY 23 as compared to FY 22 (3 v 4). They were not formal mediations. Two (2) were the EEO team working with the employee and deciding official at the formal stage to resolve the complaint. There was also a complaint that was resolved at the hearing stage via mediation with the Administrative Judge and two (2) resolved at the formal stage prior to the end of the formal investigation. However, just as many complaints/workplace issues were resolved via other methods in FY 23 than FY 22. Total cost savings for FY 23 was around \$5 million just as in FY 22. This is also after the MTF went to DHA.

3. Data Collection: Locally we keep track of our complaints on a complaint log that is used for taskers and to create briefs for the GC monthly meetings and the Deputy Commander for Administration (DCA) at our local MTF monthly meetings. The information that is kept in iComplaints is updated as the EEO team works on complaints. Lastly, we now have a point of contact that can pull our applicant data for us, where in past years we have not been able to do that.

5. Significant trends and best practices: What goes on in society spills over into what occurs on the installation and impacts the types of complaints received. For example, one of the trends that is still ongoing, but not as prevalent as it was the past two years, is Critical Race Theory, which is not the law. Until Critical Race Theory became known, race was never in our top 5 for basis. There are some employees that feel that due to their race being Black, they are automatically being discriminated against. However, that is not what the law states. The current trend this year were complaints due to disciplinary action that were not appealable to Merit System Protection Board (MSPB) and harassment for taking said actions. One of our best practices is using the Anti-harassment program to resolve workplace issues at the lowest level. It has been established over the past few years that employees that feel they have been harassed are looking for punishment for those whom they feel have done the harassing. Clearly and simply explaining both the complaint and anti-harassment processes usually results in the employee only wanting to use the anti-harassment program. We have had a significantly high success rate using this method to resolve workplace issues at the lowest level. This puts the workplace issues in the supervisors' hands to investigate and take appropriate action to stop. This also helps build trust between employees and their supervisor and employees now know they can contact their supervisor and trust they will investigate and address their concerns.

F. Responsiveness and Legal Compliance

Strengths

1. When the EEO team receives a compliance order from the EEOC, it is put into iComplaints, tracked on our spreadsheet, and a follow up reminder put on our Outlook calendar. Plus, the EEO team

has a great working relationship with our labor attorney, resource management office, and personnel office and all work well together to make sure all items in the compliance memo are met and are done so timely. The EEO office continues to coordinate complaint documents (Acceptance Letter, Dismissal Letter, etc.) with the Fort Leavenworth labor attorney at OSJA for legal sufficiency within five (5) calendar days. The Fort Riley EEO team works proactively on all our complaints to ensure timeliness.

2. Fort Riley did not have issues with noncompliance in fiscal year 23. There were no findings of discrimination in the 11 other complaints that were closed this fiscal year.

3. Fort Riley has completed its MD 715 on time for the past nine (9) years. The Fort Riley EEO office has no control over what Army Headquarters does and whether their report is submitted to the EEOC or not.

Part E.3: Workforce Analyses

The below figure illustrates a three (3) year trend of Fort Riley's civilian workforce compared to the U.S. Civilian Labor Force (CLF) based on the ethnicity reported by civilian employees. These numbers include both Appropriated Fund and Non-appropriated Fund employees. This is the only location that captures both populations. Additionally, the data on Ethnicity, Race, and Identification (ERI) is not 100% accurate as many civilian employees have not reported or accurately reported their race. The numbers below are percentages of the population on Fort Riley controlled by the Department of the Army.

Total Workforce Three-year trend by Ethnicity Race and Identification (ERI) and Gender by Comparison to CLF

	Total by Gender		Hispanic or Latino		White		Black or African American		Asian		NH/PI		AI/AN		Two or More Races	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
FY21	44.7	55.25	2.21	2.58	33.21	33.02	4.97	5.04	.55	1.32	.18	.25	.29	.14	3.31	12.86
FY22	44.7	55.28	2.28	2.63	32.69	33.04	4.99	5.25	.68	1.29	.15	.22	.34	.22	3.54	12.59
FY23	51.1	48.89	3.17	5.49	37.32	21.43	5.91	6.6	.63	2.27	.26	.16	.74	.69	4.91	10.40
CLF	51.3	48.7	3.6	2.8	42.1	40.4	3.7	3.8	0.00	0.00	.50	.50	.50	.50	.90	.80

This is the first time in the past three (3) years that males have exceeded the number of females that is due to the shift of 90% (approximately 900 employees) of the local Medical Treatment Facility (MTF) employees over to the Defense Health Agency (DHA). The percentages in red are Fort Riley's percent of the workforce by race compared to the CLF which are below the CLF. The percent of females are significantly lower in FY 23 compared to FY 22 and FY 21 for all races except Two or More. The MTF had a high number of female employees versus male employees. Now the Garrison is the largest employer on Fort Riley and the employees are primarily male based on the mission of the Garrison. Therefore, the rest of this report will look different than in past years due to the shift of the MTF over to DHA. Although still under the CLF, Hispanic males continue to increase each year because Two or more Races continues to grow, exceeding the CLF, and having completed a deeper dive into which two races resulting in most of them having Hispanic as one of the races. Therefore, a more accurate picture of the Hispanic population

This is the first year without all the MTF employees as part of the assessment. Therefore, it is hard to determine what are actual barriers and what is tied to the loss of the MTF employees. It does appear that more males are being hired versus females.

Disability Workforce in Comparison to 501 Goals

	Total Workforce by grade grouping	Detail by Disability Status				Detail for Targeted Disabilities											
		No Disability	Not Identified	Disability PWD 501 Goal = 12%	Persons w/Targeted Disability PWTD Goal = 2%	Developmental Disability	Traumatic Brain Injury	Deaf or Serious Difficulty Hearing	Blind or Serious Difficulty Seeing	Missing Extremities	Significant Mobility Impairment	Partial or Complete Paralysis	Epilepsy or Other Seizure Disorders	Intellectual Disability	Significant Psychiatric Disorder	Dwarfism	Significant Disfigurement
(GS10 and Below)	621	415/66.8 %	105/16.9%	101 or 16.26 %	35 or 5.6%	0	4	5	2	0	0	0	1	2	21	0	0
(GS11 and Above)	693	500/72.2 %	67/9.7 %	126 or 18.18 %	23 or 3.3%	0	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0

The first column includes the total number of DA civilians in each grade group and includes all pay plans based on salaries comparable to the GS pay grades.

In each block in the “Detail by Disability Status”, include the number of employees, and the percentage. In the GS-10 and below group, there are a total of 621 employees. Of them, 415/66.8% have No disability. 101 are PWD, so in that block list: 101/16.9% which is 4.9% above the 12%. Of the 101, 35 have a targeted disability (PWTD), or 5.6%, which is 3.6% above the 2% goal. In the GS-11 and above group, there are a total of 693 employees. Of them, 500/72.2% have No disability. 126 are PWD, or 18.18%, which is 6.18% above the 12% goal. Of the 126, 23 have a targeted disability, or 5.6%, which is 3.6% above the goal of 2%.

A program deficiency is lack of knowledge by employees to update their disability code in MyBiz when it changes.

Even without the additional employees from the MTF that are now under DHA, PWD and PWTD goals have been exceeded this fiscal year. PWD total was 13.24% in FY 22 and 17.27% in FY 23, a significant increase of 3.03%. PWTD was at 3.6% over all in FY 22. FY 23 has increased to 4.4%, or by 0.08%, which is a significant increase for PWTD. This is due to the increase in self-reporting by employees who have a targeted disability. The fear of reporting a disability and the negative stigma that went with it is no longer a barrier. The data is not 100% accurate but we are gaining on it each year.

The EEO team will work on revamping our training on updating disability codes in MyBiz as well as creating a marketing package for the Garrison Commander to push out to the workforce. The EEO team will also have the Garrison Commander push it at the next Address to the Workforce to help resolve this barrier.

Senior Grade Salary Distribution

	Total by Gender		Hispanic or Latino		White		Black or African American		Asian		NH/PI		AI/AN		Two or More Races	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
GS13	62/57.4 %	46/42.6 %	3/2.8 %	4/3.7 %	50/46.3 %	37/34.3 %	8/7.4 %	4/3.7 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	1/1.12 %	1/1.12 %
GS14	23/77 %	7/23 %	0	0	21/70 %	6/20 %	2/6.7 %	1/3.3 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS15	5/100 %	0	0	0	5/100 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CLF	51.80 %	48.20 %	6.80 %	6.20 %	35.70 %	31.80 %	5.7 %	6.6 %	2.20 %	2.20 %	0.10 %	0.10 %	.30 %	.30 %	1.00 %	1.10 %

Fort Riley does not have a lot of females in higher graded positions and therefore the salaries are lower than the CLF. GS-13 is the only grade level that is close to meeting the CLF. Fort Riley has zero females at the GS-15 level.

There have been no new opportunities to hire at the GS-15 level in fiscal year. The GS-13 and GS-14 positions that were hired in FY 23 were all white males in the Garrison. What was discovered in analyzing the applicant flow data is that most of the American Indians that applied for positions were not qualified and not referred. Almost twice as many white males applied for the vacant positions than minorities (44 vs 21 respectively). Both whites and minorities had 11 that were not qualified and therefore not referred. That means there were 33 whites and 10 minorities that were referred. This causes the number of minorities to drop from half as many as the whites to less than a third making the referral list.

A barrier this year was low staffing levels within the EEO office. Normally the EEO team sends the Garrison Directors their demographics quarterly, so they are aware of what they look like. This year the EEO team was not able to do that. Our goal next year is to do so quarterly as we have done in the past. This keeps it fresh in their minds and helps with their hiring practices. The EEO team will also sit in on the hire grade level hiring panels as a non-voting member to ensure their hiring practices are not discriminatory.

Senior Grade Disability Salary Distribution

	Total Workforce by grade	Detail by Disability Status				Detail for Targeted Disabilities											
		No Disability	Not Identified	Disability PWD 501 Goal = 12%	Persons w/Targeted Disability PWTD Goal = 2%	Developmental Disability	Traumatic Brain Injury	Deaf or Serious Difficulty Hearing	Blind or Serious Difficulty Seeing	Missing Extremities	Significant Mobility Impairment	Partial or Complete Paralysis	Epilepsy or Other Seizure Disorders	Intellectual Disability	Significant Psychiatric Disorder	Dwarfism	Significant Disfigurement
GS 13	108	82/76 %	6	20/24 .1%	7/6.5%	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
GS 14	30	23/76 .7%	2	5/23 .3%	0/0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS 15	5	1/20 %	3	1/80 %	0/0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The only issue is there are no employees at the GS-14 and GS-15 levels that have reported a targeted disability. Most have stated they have a disability but do not wish to disclose what it is. I firmly believe there are individuals at that level that have a targeted disability but do not wish to report it.

The barrier is the stigma with reporting a targeted disability of a significant psychiatric disorder at the higher grade levels for fear it will negatively impact their careers. The EEO team will continue to work on developing new trainings to try and get these employees to report what their disability is. The EEO team will also be working on marketing material for the Garrison commander to push out to the employees.

FY23 Applicant Flow Data by ERI and Gender

	Total by Gender		Hispanic or Latino		White		Black or African American		Asian		NH/PI		AI/AN		Two or More Races	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Applications	1013/62.1%	618/37.89%	132/8.09%	95/5.82%	635/38.93%	327/20.04%	160/9.81%	115/7.05%	36/2.21%	41/2.51%	9/0.55%	10/0.61%	14/0.86%	13/0.8%	15/0.92%	9/0.55%
Qualified Applicants	614/73.36%	223/26.64%	64/7.65%	34/4.06%	414/49.76%	104/12.43%	90/10.75%	56/6.7%	19/2.27%	10/1.19%	6/0.72%	3/0.36%	10/1.19%	5/0.6%	10/1.19%	5/0.6%
Referred	590/77.73%	169/22.27%	60/7.91%	29/3.82%	405/53.36%	79/10.41%	81/10.67%	41/5.4%	19/2.5%	5/0.6%	6/0.79%	3/0.4%	5/0.6%	4/0.53%	8/1.05%	4/0.53%

Applicants																
Selections (Permanent)	80/78.43%	22/21.57%	5/4.9%	1/0.98%	59/57.84%	12/11.76%	6/5.88%	5/4.9%	3/2.94%	1/0.98%	1/0.98%	0	2/1.96%	1/0.98%	2/1.96%	1/0.98%
Selections (Temporary)	1/100%	0	0	0	1/100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CLF	51.3	48.7	3.6	2.8	42.1	40.4	3.7	3.8	0.00	0.00	.50	.50	.50	.50	.90	.80

Fort Riley, across the board, is not meeting the CLF for female applicants, particularly for two or more races, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, White, and generally when comparing female applicants to males.

Special note: 141 opted to not disclose their ethnicity and race and, of that 141, 124 opted to not disclose their gender. That accounts for 8.03% and 7.07%, respectively, of the 1755 total applicants.

FY23 Disability Army Applicant Flow Data

	Total	Detail by Disability Status				Detail for Targeted Disabilities											
		No Disability	Not Identified	Disability PWD 501 Goal = 12%	Persons w/Targeted Disability PWTG Goal = 2%	Developmental Disability	Traumatic Brain Injury	Deaf or Serious Difficulty Hearing	Blind or Serious Difficulty Seeing	Missing Extremities	Significant Mobility Impairment	Partial or Complete Paralysis	Epilepsy or Other Seizure Disorders	Intellectual Disability	Significant Psychiatric Disorder	Dwarfism	Significant Disfigurement
Applications	1755	815	119	217/12.36%	97/5.53%	0	19	9	1	0	3	4	0	1	54	2	4
Qualified Applicants	879	422	59	113/12.86%	44/5.01%	0	7	2	0	0	3	2	0	1	25	2	2
Referred Applicants	799	375	55	95/11.89%	40/5.01%	0	6	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	24	2	2
Selections (Permanent)	115	56	8	4/3.48%	2/1.74%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Selections (Temporary)	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Data in this graphic is skewed due to **507** applicants choosing not to answer demographic information regarding disability. Percentage is based on the 'total' column, not the subtotal of the 'detail by disability status' columns.

Special note: Data in the 'selections (permanent)' and 'selections (temporary)' do not represent term appointments. Out of **108** total applications for term appointments, **0** PWD or PWTG were selected for these vacancies.

FY23 Total Workforce Award Distribution

	Total by Gender		Hispanic or Latino		White		Black or African American		Asian		NH/PI		AI/AN		Two or More Races	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
% of Permanent WF	51.1	48.89	3.17	5.49	37.32	21.43	5.91	6.6	.63	2.27	.26	.16	.74	.69	4.91	10.40
On the spot	49.38	50.62	3.70	6.79	38.89	32.10	6.17	7.41	0	1.23	0	0	0	.62	.62	2.47

cash Awards																
Time off Awards	51.46	48.54	4.18	3.77	39.95	32.76	7.17	9.26	2.01	1.89	0	0	1.18	.71	2.65	2.18
Performance Awards	488/79%	130/21%	10/1.6%	21.32%	412/66.7%	90/14.6%	35/5.7%	18/2.9%	21.32%	21.32%	31.48%	21.32%	41.65%	51.81%	17/2.8%	15/2.43%
Special Act Service Act Awards	26/76.5%	8/23.5%	0	0	24/70.6%	8/23.5%	2/5.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quality Step Awards	11/55%	9/45%	0	0	10/50%	6/30%	1/5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The awards data above only covers the Garrison. The percent of civilian workforce is all of Fort Riley, so the percent of the awards are lower based on the data used. The information for the QSI, Special Act/Service awards, and performance awards were pulled from Business Objects from DCPDS. The other data came from the MD 715 data tables.

Since there are more males than females on board, you would expect the award distribution to be lower than that of the males. The On-the-Spot awards had the greatest distribution among the males and females of each race. The QSI awards were almost split equally between males and females. The big issue is that only one minority received a QSI. Only two (2) minorities within the Garrison received Special Act/Service awards. Fort Riley needs to do a better job of providing opportunities to excel for minorities, so they have an opportunity at awards other than performance.

The plan is to provide awards data as part of the quarterly demographic information provided to the Garrison Directors, so they can make more mindful decisions in fiscal year 24.

FY23 Disability Award Distribution

	Total	Detail by Disability Status				Detail for Targeted Disabilities											
		No Disability	Not Identified	Disability PWD 501 Goal = 12%	Persons w/Targeted Disability PWTDD Goal = 2%	Developmental Disability	Traumatic Brain Injury	Deaf or Serious Difficulty Hearing	Blind or Serious Difficulty Seeing	Missing Extremities	Significant Mobility Impairment	Partial or Complete Paralysis	Epilepsy or Other Seizure Disorders	Intellectual Disability	Significant Psychiatric Disorder	Dwarfism	Significant Disfigurement
On the Spot Award	170	114 /67.1%	29/17.1%	27/15.9%	5/2.9%	0	1/59%	1/59%	0	0	0	0	0	0	3/1.76%	0	0
Time off Award	317	201 /63.4%	53/16.7%	63/19.9%	13/4.1%	0/0%	2/63%	1/32%	0	0	0	0	0	0	9/2.8%	0	0
Performance Award	618	434 /70.2%	74/12%	108/17.8%	23/3.7%	0	3/49%	7/1.13%	4/65%	0	1/16%	0	0	0	8/1.3%	0	0
Special Act Service Act Awards	35	25/71.4%	4/11.4%	6/17.1%	1/2.9%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
QSI Award	20	14/70%	4/20%	2/10%	1/5%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Fort Riley did a great job in the distribution of awards among PWD and PWTDD. The only red is with the QSI's and PWD is just below the 12% target. All other awards are well about the 12% and 2% target goals.

The barrier that we have is the accuracy of the data due to self-reporting. Many employees also claim that they have a disability but do not wish to disclose it. Those numbers would significantly increase the percent of PWD and PWTDD.

Our goal next year is to do so quarterly as we have done in the past. This keeps it fresh in their minds and helps with their hiring practices. The EEO team will also sit in on the hire grade level hiring panels as a non-voting member to ensure their hiring practices are not discriminatory.

FY 23 Senior Grade Promotions by ERI and Gender

	Total by Gender		Hispanic or Latino		White		Black or African American		Asian		NH/PI		AI/AN		Two or More Races	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
GS-13	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-14	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SES	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Permanent WF Promotions	.67	0	0	0	.85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Permanent WF	60.9	39.1	3.60	3.26	47.9	27.2	6.4	5.2	.81	.95	.27	.13	.27	.20	1.49	2.3

Fort Riley is a medium size installation. Therefore has no Senior Executive System (SES) level employees. All categories are below the permanent workforce. There were only six (6) promotions within the senior graded positions. All were white males.

All the vacant positions had females and minorities that applied for them, qualified and referred, but none selected. There was a temp promotion that was a white male. There was a GS-13 position that had 34 applicants of which 15 were minorities. Specifically, 19 males applied for the position and 11 of those were minorities. However, a white male was selected for that position.

There is a pattern on hiring actions in most of the USAG directorates where their chain of command is all white males. There are only two (2) females who are a minority that is in a GS-13 or equivalent in a supervisory/division chief position in the USAG. There is one (1) minority male at the GS-14 grade level within the Garrison are two (2) at the GS-13 grade level. The largest number of females at the GS-13 grade level is within the office of the Staff Judge Advocate as attorneys. One of which is a minority female. The Garrison only has one (1) female director and one (1) minority that is a director. All the rest are white males. The diversity is lacking in the senior graded positions in all the directorates, except DFMWR.

The barrier is the miss assumption that minorities do not want to come to Fort Riley and do not apply for positions here. That is clearly not the case based on the applicant flow data.

Will try to supply the directors with their demographics on a quarterly basis. Sit in on all hiring panels, review resume matrices and interview questions of the senior grade level positions.

FY 23 Disability Senior Grade Promotions

To tal	Detail by Disability Status				Detail for Targeted Disabilities											
	No Disability	Not Identified	Disability PWD 501 Goal = 12%	Persons w/Targeted Disability PWD Goal = 2%	Developmental Disability	Traumatic Brain Injury	Deaf or Serious Difficulty Hearing	Blind or Serious Difficulty Seeing	Missing Extremities	Significant Mobility Impairment	Partial or Complete Paralysis	Epilepsy or Other Seizure Disorders	Intellectual Disability	Significant Psychiatric Disorder	Dwarfism	Significant Disfigurement

G S- 13	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G S- 14	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G S- 15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S E S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

The six (6) white males that were hired did not report having a disability. This fails to meet the 12% of PWD or the 2% for PWTD. These positions are the exception to exceeding the target goals of PWD and PWTD. Of those at the senior grade level that are on board but not promoted are above the PWD goal of 12% at 19.15% and PWTD goal of 2% at 6.4%. Therefore, although the six (6) that were promoted did not have a disability. The disability rates at the senior grade level over all is higher than their respective goals.

The EEO team will try to supply the directors with their demographics on a quarterly basis. Sit in on all hiring panels, review resume matrices and interview questions of the senior grade level positions.

Reasonable Accommodations and Personal Assistance Services

	# of RAs	# of RA requests for PWFA	# of RA requests for religion	#/% of approvals (Includes alternatives that were accepted by the requester)	#/% of denials	Decision Processing Time	Time to provide the accommodation (from the initial date of request to accommodations put in place)	Cost of RAs granted
Total	27	0	1	18	1	2.42 days *Avg Time	N/A	N/A

Out of 27 total RA requests, only 1 was for religion, and that employee withdrew their request. Outside of the 18 approvals, there was only 1 denial. The remaining 6, 4 were voluntary withdrawals of the request and 2 are still pending management decision based on further medical documentation.

The Fort Riley EEO office does not necessarily track the timeline of implementation with cases of back-orders on requested items but advise management to maintain close contact and updates to both the requestor and our office. The Disability Program Manager (DPM) follows up with the supervisor and does not close the RA out until the RA is in place. Managers/supervisors do not provide the DPM any associated costs with equipment purchased.

There were no requests for personal assistance services in fiscal year 2023. There was also no request for an accommodation based on Pregnant Workers Fairness Act in 2023.

DVAAP Summary FY23

Total # of Civilian Employees	# of Veterans/% of Civilian Workforce	# of Disabled Veterans/% of Civilian Workforce	# of 30% or More Disabled Veterans/% of Civilian Workforce
1475	819/55.52%	747/50.64%	458/31.05%

Fort Riley's FY23 Appropriated Fund population totaled 1,475, which is down significantly by almost 34%, as shown in Table 1, mostly due to our local Medical Treatment Facility (MTF) going under Defense Health Agency (DHA), which is another federal agency outside of Army. The Veteran population (819) makes up approximately 55.52% of the total workforce, which is an 4.89% increase from FY22. There was a decrease of 27.58% in the overall Veteran population as shown in Table 2. Within the overall workforce over half (747) are veterans with disabilities (50.64%), and nearly a third (458) are veterans rated at 30% or more disability (31.05%), which are all increases from FY22 reflected in Tables 3 and 4.

Overall Appropriated Fund Population			
FY23	FY22	Net Change	Percent Change
1475	2234	-759	-33.97%

(Table 1)

Veteran Population			
FY23	FY22	Net Change	Percent Change
819	1131	-312	-27.58%

(Table 2)

Disabled Veterans		
FY23	FY22	Percent Change
50.64%	44.81%	+5.83%

(Table 3)

Disabled Veterans 30%+		
FY23	FY22	Percent Change
31.05%	25.78%	+5.27%

(Table 4)

Despite the total workforce exhibiting a significant decrease due to the DHA undertaking, our percentages of veterans with disabilities and 30% or more disabled continue to rise. One factor is educating our workforce on keeping their personnel file accurate and up-to-date to reflect their current status ensuring our numbers are as accurate and up-to-date as possible.

Fort Riley continues to put forth substantial recruitment efforts. To highlight: During FY23: SFL/TAP and CHRA NAF participated in 44 to include the Fort Riley Hiring & Education Fair, Rock 'N Riley, Patriot Day Career Fair, Recruit Military, Hiring Our Heroes Job Fair, and Hire GI. Of the 44 job fairs and hiring events, there was an estimated of 5,264 attendees (demographics not recorded). The SFL/TAP office holds monthly Employment Workshops every 2nd Wednesday of the month averaging 30-35 Soldiers and 15-20 employers, and 12,868 personnel have signed into the TAP office itself with a lot of repeat customers.

Top 10 MCO Positions by ERI and Gender as Compared to the Occupational CLF

	Total by Gender		Hispanic or Latino		White		Black or African American		Asian		NH/PI		AI/AN		Two or More Races	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1 HR Mgmt (OCLF)	28.1/	71.9/	2.08/	5.07/	21.2/	52.3/	3.9/	8.7/	.29	2.7/	0/0	0/0	.29/	.29/	.29/	2.7/
2 IT (OCLF)	85.9/	14.1/	5.4/	2.2/	60.9/	10.9/	16.3	0/0	3.26/	1.1/	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
3 Police (OCLF)	86.4/	13.6/	0/0	4.5/	72.7/	4.5/	9.1/	0/0	0/0	0/0	4.5/	0	0/0	0/0	0/0	4.5/

4 Budget Analyst (OCLF)	44.4/35	55.6/62.5	0/0	0/0	44.4/25	44.4/62.5	0/0	55.5/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/10	5.55/0
5 Social Work (OCLF)	35.3/26.7	64.7/72.6	0/0	5.88/7	29.4/20.3	5.9/3.5	23.5/4.1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	5.9/5
6 Logistics (OCLF)	100/63.3	0/13.3	0/0	0/0	91.7/50	0/13.3	0/13.3	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	8.3/0	0/0
7 Security Admin (OCLF)	90.9/0	9.1/0	0/0	0/0	72.7/0	9.1/0	9.1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	9.1/0	0/0
8 Traffic Mgmt (OCLF)	72.7/0	27.7/0	0/0	0/0	63.6/0	18.8/0	9.1/0	9.1/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
9 Training (OCLF)	90/27.1	10/71	0/1.5	0/1.8	80/22.6	0/66.1	0/5	0/2.9	0/0	0/8	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/3.2	10/0
10 Financial Admin (OCLF)	66.7/0	33.3/1	0/0	0/0	66.7/0	33.3/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0

Most of the data on the top 10 positions occupied were at or above their CLF. Only three (3) MCO positions, Budget Analyst, Training, and Logistics for Black and Two or More Races males are below the CLF. White females are below in the same three (3) positions. Hispanic females are below the CLF for Social Work and training MCO positions. Most of the females were below the CLF for training.

One (1) female that was hired in FY 23 in training and belongs to Two or More Races. The female was hired at the lowest grade level of GS-09 for training for the Garrison. White females had the most positions below the CLF (budget, logistics, and training). Next were Hispanic females and Black males with two (2) each. Social work/Training and Logistics/Training respectively. Training is all white males and females of Two or More Races only. Therefore, unless the other races were zero, they were below the CLF. There was only one (1) hiring action for Training in FY 23. Six (6) applications were received. Of those six (6), four (4) were not eligible. The individual that was selected omitted their demographic data. There are no females in logistics, which is not a Garrison function. Those positions fall under Sustainment Command and FORSCOM. They are all white males with one (1) exception that is Black. The Garrison only has one Social Worker, and they are a Black female. The rest are at the local medical treatment facility (MTF).

Currently, the EEO team needs to conduct a barrier analysis to determine why females are not applying for positions within the Garrison and why so many have left. The EEO team will accomplish this by conducting interviews with the females in each directorate to determine if there are any barriers that need to be addressed.

Top 10 MCO Positions by Disability Compared to the 501 Goal

	To tal	Detail by Disability Status				Detail for Targeted Disabilities												
		No Disab ility	Not Identi fied	Disa bility PWD 501 Goal = 12%	Perso ns w/Tar geted Disabi lity PWD Goal = 2%	Devel op- ment al Disa bility	Trau matic Brain Injury	Deaf or Serio us Diffi culty Heari ng	Blind or Serio us Diffi culty Seei ng	Missin g Extre mities	Signifi cant Mobilit y Impair ment	Parti al or Comple te Paral ysis	Epile psy or Other Seizu re Disor ders	Intelle tual Disabi lity	Signifi cant Psychi atric Disord er	Dwar fism	Signific ant Disfigur ement	
1 HR Mgm t	33 5	256/7 6.4%	32/9. 6%	47/14 %	12/3.6 %	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0
2 IT	92	57/62 %	7/7.6 %	28/30 .4%	3/3.3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Polic e	22	15/68. 1%	5/22. 7%	2/9.1 %	1/4.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

4 Bud get Anal yst	18	15/83. 3%	1/5.6 %	2/11. 1%	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5 Soci al Wor ker	17	13/76. 5%	2/11. 8%	2/11. 8%	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6 Logis tics	12	7/58.3 %	3/25 %	2/16. 7%	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7 Secu rity	11	9/81.8 %	2/18. 2%	0%	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8 Traffi c	11	10/90. 9%	0	1/9.1 %	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9 Train ing	10	5/50%	4/40 %	1/10 %	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 Fina ncial	9	8/88.9 %	0%	1/33. 3%	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Most of the 10 MCO positions are below the goal of 12% for PWD and 2% for PWTD. However, all but the Security positions are close to the 12% for PWD at 9% - 11%. That cannot be said for PWTD. Most all of those positions do not have anyone with a targeted disability.

Many individuals that have a disability report as not wishing to identify their disability. Those numbers are not figured into the PWD or PWTD. If they were added in all but two (2) would exceed the 12% for PWD and 25 for PWTD, which would be a more accurate picture of that data.

The biggest barrier is accurate self-reporting of this information. Our goal next year is to do so quarterly as we have done in the past. This keeps it fresh in their minds and helps with their hiring practices. The EEO team will also sit in on the hire grade level hiring panels as a non-voting member to ensure their hiring practices are not discriminatory.

FY23 Complaint Processing

Total Inventory (462)	Substantiated Findings	Median Formal days	Number of formals beyond 180 days	Number of formals accepted or dismissed	Number of formals remanded	Number of ADRs offered	Number of ADRs accepted
23	0	364.50	0	10	1	0	0

There were 10 formal complaints filed in FY23 which is 2 more than were filed in FY22 despite the transition of approximately 900 hospital employees from Army to Defense Health Agency (DHA). However, there were 64 contacts in FY23 and approximately 72% were resolved at contact stage which was slightly better than FY22 where there were 65 contacts and 70% resolved at contact stage. The percentage of precomplaints that filed formal was higher in FY23 (56%) vs FY22 (32%) though the number of precomplaints were similar – FY23 (18) vs FY22 (19). There were more cases that were resolved at the formal investigation stage in FY23. There were 13 formal closed in FY23 – FAA (AJ) – (2), FAD – (7), Settlement (non-ADR) – (3) and Withdrawal – (1).

The 13 formals that carried over to FY 23 include 2 from FY19, 1 from FY20, and 3 from FY21. The age of these cases contributed to the increase in medial formal days which is about double that of FY22.

Processing at the local level is timely – no issues at local level determined by self assessment.

FY23 Total Cost of Investigation

Cost	\$	Delta from FY22
Investigations	29,568.00	-25K
Settlements	0	0

There were 6 investigations that closed in FY23: 3 from FY22 and 3 from FY23. There are 4 formals from FY23 with investigations requested but not started that will carry over to FY24.

There were three (3) formal complaints that were resolved with a settlement agreement. None of which resulted with any monies being paid out.

FY23 Top 5 Issues and Basis of Formal Complaints Filed

Issues	# of Complaints	Delta from FY22
Harassment – Non-Sexual	8	-2
Disciplinary Action	4	-4
Other Terms and Conditions of Employment	4	+2
Termination	3	0
Awards	2	+2
Basis	# of Complaints	Delta from FY22
Sex	5	+2
Disability (1 Mental / 2 Physical)	3	-9
Reprisal	2	-3
Race	1	-10
Age	1	-2

Although the number of complaints for each is down compared to FY22, Harassment and Disciplinary Action continue to be in the top 5 issues. Of note, there were no claims of sexual harassment. Most of the claims of harassment were brought up in background information to other claims. In most cases, had a management official not taken an action such as termination or suspension, it seems that the complainants would never have otherwise perceived or reported any harassment.

The number of complaints with Race and Disability as bases have both dropped significantly from FY22. Although this is due in part to the transition of approximately 900 hospital employees to DHA, there may also be other reasons for the decline. Last year, there seemed to be a number of complaints with Race as a basis because the complainants perceived Critical Race Theory as the law. In FY23, more explanation was provided via training and intake so that complainants had a better understanding of the basis. The EEO office provided additional trainings on the Reasonable Accommodation process in FY23, and this may have helped reduce the number of claims with Disability as a basis.

Part E.4: FY23 Accomplishments/Initiatives

Accomplishments

Despite being short staffed for more than half the fiscal year, the EEO team did manage to complete a few of our goals for fiscal year 23.

PWD and PWTD were promoted in fiscal year 2023. Of those that reported their demographics. There were two (2) PWD that were promoted and two (2) PWTD that were promoted. In fiscal year 22, there were no PWD and PWTD that were promoted.

The EEO team was able to create and deploy the first exit interview for the Garrison. The EEO team is tracking the data from the surveys to monitor for any barriers or triggers.

The EEO Officer worked with the Air Traffic Control (ATC) manager on the lack of PWD and PWTD in ATC positions. After working with the ATC manager and running a BOBi it was determined the data in the MD 715 was incorrect and there are PWD and PWTD in ATC positions.

The EEO team worked with the Resource Management Office to determine the reason why the median award amount was lower for females than males, is due to the median grade for males being higher than females. More females received awards than males. There are more males in higher graded positions than females. Many of the females that have left those positions have been replaced by white males. Thus, throwing off the median award.

Finally, we now have a point of contact that has access to Applicant Flow data that was able to pull ours in September 2023 for the MD 715 report.

Hispanic Initiatives

In FY23, the EEO staff conducted interviews with supervisors and employees across the large Directorates to determine if there are any barriers for minorities to include the Hispanic population. It was acknowledged that there is not much cultural diversity in the surrounding communities except for what Fort Riley and Kansas State University bring to the area. The result appears to be that, although the community and workforce are welcoming, Hispanics seeking cultural connection may not find the area appealing. The Fort Riley EEO office continues to partner with Army Community Service (ACS) to promote cultural opportunities offered by Relocation Services to help Hispanics make the desired cultural connections. The EEO office also helps to promote the educational, employment, and citizenship opportunities that are offered on Fort Riley.

A review of applicant data revealed that, of the applicants who provided ERI, there were 161 applications from Hispanic individuals to Fort Riley APF vacancies in FY23. This was the second largest group of minority applicants. There were 62 Hispanic Females and 99 were Hispanic Males. There were 61 out of the 161 Hispanic applicants referred and 9 were selected. Of the 9 selected, 5 were Male and 4 were Female. All the selectees were entered on duty. Many of the applicants who were not referred were rated as not qualified, so there may be issues with educational requirements or the way the information is presented on the resume/application. One goal for FY 24 is to explore the reasons behind the ratings.

In FY23 a local leader development program was piloted. Fort Riley's Basic Executive Leader Training (BELT) was created to developed as an executive level leadership program that is focused on training and equipping Fort Riley Department of Army civilians to successfully lead people, organizations, programs, and projects. It includes training on topics such as creating storyboards, writing information

papers, creating decision briefs, and briefing senior leaders. There were two (2) sessions held in FY23 with a total of twenty (20) participants. One (1) of the participants was Hispanic. This is an area that can continue to be developed to encourage more Hispanic employees to participate.

Intelligence Initiatives

This is a new initiative. Fort Riley does not have any Intelligence positions here on Fort Riley.

Intelligence/Security Initiatives:

This section is the Composition, Hiring, Promotion, and Attrition of Intelligence and Security members of your organization by Gender, Ethnicity and Race Indicator (ERI), Disability status, grade level, and veteran status.

Below is the information on the security positions, or the 0080 series, here on Fort Riley. The first table is the security positions by ERI and Gender.

Security Positions by ERI and Gender as Compared to the Occupational CLF

	Total by Gender		Hispanic or Latino		White		Black or African American		Asian		NH/PI		AI/AN		Two or More Races	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total # 155	140	15	6	1	113	8	10	3	3	1	2	0	1	0	5	2
Percent	90.3	9.7	3.9	.65	72.9	5.2	6.5	1.9	1.9	.65	1.3	0	.65	0	3.2	1.3
CLF	51.3	48.7	3.6	2.8	42.1	40.4	3.7	3.8	0.00	0.00	.50	.50	.50	.50	.90	.80

In reference to the security positions, they are lacking in all female categories except Asian and Two or More races. Females are overall under represented in the security field. The security field is a male dominated field. There are males in each category, so the workforce is diverse for males.

There is an open continuous announcement for the security guard positions. Management also has direct hire authority for those positions. However, management still has a hard time recruiting for and retaining those positions. They have a hard time getting beyond 50% staffing levels.

One barrier is the security guards work outside in the elements. Kansas can have some extreme shifts in temperatures in a very short period of time. Plus there is competition with the local MTF having security positions that are indoor positions. Another barrier is the amount of pay the security guards receive. Management feels it is still too low to attract candidates. Local management use all the hiring incentives (3 R's) and still cannot attract and retain more than 50% staffing levels.

The USAG cannot do anything about the security guards working in the outdoor elements or the grade level of the positions. What the EEO team will do is interview the current security guards to find out if there are any additional barriers to employment.

Security Positions by Disability

	Total	Detail by Disability Status				Detail for Targeted Disabilities										
		No Disability	Not Identified	Disability PW D 501 Goal = 12%	Persons w/Targeted Disability PWT D	Developmental Disability	Traumatic Brain Injury	Deaf or Serious Difficulty Hearing	Blind or Serious Difficulty Seeing	Missing Extremities	Significant Mobility Impairment	Partial or Complete Paralysis	Epilepsy or Other Seizure Disorder	Intellectual Disability	Significant Psychiatric Disorder	Dwarfism

					Goal = 2%								Order s				
	15 5	114/ 73.6 %	29	8/5. 2%	4/2.6 %		1	1						1	1		

Based on the data on PWD is well below the 501 goal of 12% by more than six (6) percent. However, PWTD are above the 2% 501 goal at 2.6%. Security personnel must be able to pass the physical agility test and physical exam in order to be on boarded. This requirement limits the number and types of disabilities that an individual can have to be in a security position.

The barrier is accurate self reporting of a disability. If you look at the Not Identified column. It is 18.7% who have a disability but did not want to specify what disability they have. Those additional employees could be added to the 5.2%, which would put Fort Riley over the the 501 goal of 12% by 11.9%. They could also be added to the PWTD and raise that percent as well.

The EEO team will work on a new marketing campaign to emphasize the need for accurate reporting of their disability. The EEO team will also have the Garrison Commander push out the material and encourage Garrison employees to update their disability information in MyBiz.

Explain graphic : Security Positions by Veterans Preference

	Total by Gender		No Vet Preference		5-Point		10-Point/30%		10-Point/Other	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total # 155	140	15	55	8	48	2	36	4	1	1
Percent	90.3	9.7	35.5	5.2	30.97	1.3	23.2	2.6	.65	.65

More than half of the security personnel are veterans (59.3%). Fort Riley has always done well in hiring veterans both male and female. Many veterans when they retire stay here. This reaffirms that Fort Riley is the Army's Best Place to Live, Train, Deploy From, Come Home to, and Retire. Others leave to go back home and to find jobs in other locations.

Security Positions by Grade Level, Gender, and ERI

Series & Grade	Total by Gender		Hispanic or Latino		White		Black or African American		Asian		NH/PI		AI/AN		Two or More Races	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
GS-0080-09	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0080-11	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
GS-0080-12	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0081-04	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0081-05	5	3	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
GS-0081-06	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0081-07	31	1	1	0	30	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0081-08	10	1	0	0	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0081-09	4	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
GS-0081-11	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0081-12	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0081-13	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0083-06	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0083-07	6	2	1	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0083-08	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0083-09	9	1	0	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0083-11	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0083-12	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0083-13	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0085-06	22	4	0	0	17	1	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
GS-0085-07	8	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0085-08	7	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0085-09	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0085-10	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0086-05	6	3	0	0	4	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
GS-0086-06	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-0089-12	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Based on the above data most of the security employees are white male, especially at the higher grade levels. There are no females or minorities at the GS-12 through GS-13 grade levels. All supervisor and managers are white males to include the Deputy Directorate of Emergency Services. This is in spite of the number of females and minorities that apply for those positions. It is thought the majority of the people living in this area are white and therefore that is who applies for the positions on Fort Riley for the most part. The applicant flow data shows that for the GS-0083-12 security position, there were 25 applicants, 16 of which were ineligible, and only four (4) of those were minorities while 10 were white. There were only nine (9) eligible applicants of which there was a single minority male and female among those nine (9) eligible, or 22.2%, the other seven (7), or 77.8%, were white. In looking at the other security position applicant flow data, it appears that more minorities than whites fail to meet eligibility for these positions.

The EEO team will work with human resources to review and discuss the eligibility requirements for the security positions to see if there are any barriers there. Will also work with human resources to determine how many selections are not able to pass the PAT, physical or obtain a clearance to determine if there are any barriers there.

** New Requirements in the FY23 Report. Organizations will include the following in Part E.4.

Part E.5: FY23 Planned Activities

Hispanic males are still underrepresented on Fort Riley. The EEO team will interview the workforce to identify potential barriers for Hispanic males and other minorities that may be preventing them from being selected for positions here on Fort Riley. If any barriers are identified, the EEO office will develop an action plan and coordinate with the command team and directors.

There were no PWD or PWTD promoted in FY 23. We will review the promotion, hiring practices and policies on Fort Riley to identify any barriers to hiring PWD and PWTD on Fort Riley. We will also continue to review matrices for resumes, review interview questions and sit in on hiring panels. If any barriers are identified, the EEO office will develop an action plan and coordinate with the command team and directors.

There is an underrepresentation of PWD in air traffic controller positions. The EEO team's goal is to interview the air traffic controllers to see if any of them have a disability that they have not reported and get them to report it. Will also interview management to see if there are any unknown barriers to hiring PWD and PWTD.

Discrepancy in median awards between females and males. The EEO team will research and identify any barriers as to why the median awards for females are lower than for males, when there are more females employed on Fort Riley. We do know that there are more males at the higher grade levels than females are one cause of the issue. We will also ask for an analyze directorate awards policies.

There are a low number of women and minorities in GS-14 and GS-15 positions on Fort Riley. The EEO team will work with managers and directors to make sure that there are no barriers to their hiring practices by reviewing their practices and policies.

The EEO Office will work with senior leaders on any action plans for implementation into their strategic plans for the next fiscal year. This will be completed after the barrier analysis has been completed.

The EEO Officer will work with the command team on doing exit interviews to use it as a tool to improve the work environment. The EEO Office will be the proponent for the exit interviews.